The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 **BOILERMAKERS NATIONAL** Case No. C09-00037MJP ANNUITY TRUST FUND, on behalf of 10 itself and all others similarly situated, **DEFENDANTS' JOINT MOTION** FOR REVISION TO BRIEFING 11 SCHEDULE FOR MOTION TO Plaintiff, **DISMISS** 12 v. NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR: WAMU MORTGAGE PASS THROUGH 13 CERTIFICATES, SERIES AR1, et al., **April 13, 2010** 14 Defendants. 15 DORAL BANK PUERTO RICO, on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated, 16 Plaintiff. 17 v. 18 WASHINGTON MUTUAL ASSET ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION, et al. 19 Defendants. 20 I. RELIEF REQUESTED 21 All of the Defendants respectfully request that the Court modify slightly the 22 briefing schedule for the motions to dismiss so as to provide Defendants with ten days to 23

prepare their reply briefs instead of the four days allotted under the current schedule

without changing the noting date set by the Court and without shortening Plaintiffs'

opposition briefing time. Defendants propose to create the additional time by filing their

DEFENDANTS' JOINT MOTION FOR REVISION TO BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS (NO. 09-0037MJP) - 1

Riddell Williams P.S. 1001 FOURTH AVENUE SUITE 4500 SEATTLE, WA 98154-1192 206.624.3600

24

25

26

8

13

15

14

16 17

18

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

26

4836-3391-2581.08 040210/1544/45991.00015

motions to dismiss six calendar days earlier than required. Plaintiffs are not jointly requesting this modification, but they do not oppose it.

The requested reply time is shorter than the fourteen days allowed for motion to dismiss reply briefs under the former schedules, and would not change the Local Rule 7(d)(3) noting date of the motions to dismiss. The extension allows Defendants to more fully yet efficiently address the arguments in Plaintiffs' opposition briefs – arguments that will be complex and well-developed because Plaintiffs have had Defendants' motions to dismiss since they were filed in late January – returning fairness and parity to the briefing schedule without significantly delaying the case.

II. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

Plaintiffs filed their original complaint on January 12, 2009, but did not assert claims against the Rating Agencies until their November 23, 2009 Amended Complaint. (Dkt. No. 103). Shortly thereafter, the Court ordered Plaintiffs to file their Amended Consolidated Complaint by December 31, 2009. (Dkt. No. 118). The Court also set a briefing schedule for motions to dismiss acknowledging that additional time was necessary to sufficiently brief the complex legal issues raised by the complaint. That briefing schedule required Defendants to move to dismiss within 30 days of the filing of the Second Amended Consolidated Complaint (by January 29), gave Plaintiffs' four weeks to file their opposition (by February 26), and gave Defendants two more weeks to file their reply (by March 12).

The Court subsequently ordered this action consolidated with the related case of Doral Bank Puerto Rico, et al., v. Washington Mutual Asset Acceptance Corp., Case No. 09-1557MJP. (Dkt. No. 54). The Court instructed Plaintiffs to file an amended consolidated complaint, rendering moot the pending motions to dismiss and to amend. *Id.* The Court ordered Defendants to file their motions to dismiss within 30 days of the new

consolidated complaint and to note that motion for consideration under the timeline set forth in Local Rule 7(d)(3).

Plaintiffs filed their Second Amended Consolidated Complaint on April 1, 2010. Therefore, Defendants' motions to dismiss are due on May 3. Pursuant to Local Rule 7(d)(3), those motions would be noted for four Fridays later on May 28, with Plaintiffs' opposition briefs due on May 24 and Defendants' reply briefs due May 28.

III. ARGUMENT

Defendants ask the Court to allow them six additional days (for a total of ten days) to submit their motion to dismiss reply briefs, without changing the noting date set by the Court. Plaintiffs received Defendants' original motions to dismiss in late January, giving them nearly <u>four months</u> to research and draft their oppositions by the time their briefs will come due. In contrast, Defendants will have only <u>four days</u> to address those opposition arguments under the current schedule – arguments that are likely to be complex, lengthy, and varied, and involve new legal arguments as result of newly added or amended claims.

The Court should allow Defendants ten days to draft and file their reply brief, instead of the four days currently allowed under Local Rule 7(d)(3), to ensure that Defendants receive a full and fair opportunity to develop and present their reply arguments in an effective and concise manner. That short extension will preserve the current motions to dismiss noting date, and therefore not result in any delay of the case. It also preserves Plaintiffs' time to submit their opposition briefs. Defendants bear any burden of the proposed schedule by agreeing to file their motions to dismiss early. The short requested extension is particularly appropriate in the case of the Rating Agencies because they only just entered this matter at the end of last year and have actively sought dismissal of claims against them since that time.

¹ May 1 falls on a Saturday, making Defendants' motions to dismiss due on the next court day, May 3.

1	Therefore, Defendants propose the following briefing schedule, which has been
2	agreed to by Plaintiffs:
3	April 27, 2010 Defendants file their motion to dismiss
4	May 18, 2010 Plaintiffs file their opposition
5	May 28, 2010 Defendants file their reply
6	A motion to dismiss filed on May 3 would ordinarily be noted for May 28 under the "four
7	Fridays" timeline in Local Rule 7(d)(3). Defendants calculated the proposed schedule
8	using that "four Fridays" May 28 noting date, with earlier agreed filing dates to preserve
9	the briefing time ordinarily given to all parties under Local Rule 7(d)(3).
10	IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
11	For the foregoing reasons, the Court should enter a briefing schedule stating that, if
12	Defendants file their motions to dismiss by April 27, Plaintiffs' oppositions shall be due
13	May 18 and Defendants' reply briefs shall be due May 28.
14	DATED this 2 nd day of April, 2010.
15	RIDDELL WILLIAMS P.S.
16	D /-/ D1 I - I/ 1/-
17	By /s/ Paul J. Kundtz Paul J. Kundtz, WSBA #13548
18	Gavin W. Skok, WSBA #29766 Riddell Williams P.S.
19	1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4500 Seattle, Washington 98154-1192
20	Telephone: 206-624-3600
21	Floyd Abrams (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Adam Zurofsky (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
22	Tammy L. Roy (<i>pro hac vice</i>) CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP
23	80 Pine Street New York, New York 10005
24	Telephone: 212-701-3000 Facsimile: 212-269-5420
25	Counsel for The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
26	

1	LANE POWELL PC
2	
3	By/s/ Larry S. Gangnes
4	Larry S. Gangnes, WSBA #8118 Lane Powell PC
5	1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100 Seattle, Washington 98101-2338
6	Telephone: 206-223-7036
7	Joshua M. Rubins James J. Coster
	SATTERLEE STEPHENS BURKE &
8	BURKE LLP 230 Park Avenue, Suite 1130
9	New York, New York 10169 Telephone: 212-818-9200
10	Facsimile: 212-818-9606
11	Counsel for Moody's Investor Services, Inc.
12	HILLIS CLARK MARTIN & PETERSON
13	By /s/ Louis D. Peterson
14	Brian C. Free, WSBA #35788
15	Louis D. Peterson Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson
16	1221 Second Ave., Suite 500 Seattle, WA 98101-2925
17	Telephone: 206-470-7646
18	David M. Balabanian John D. Pernick
19	Frank Busch BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
20	Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
21	Telephone: 415-393-2544 Facsimile: 415-262-9203
22	-and-
23	
	Susan L. Hoffman 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4400
24	Los Angeles, CA 90071-3106 Telephone: 213-680-6454
25	Facsimile: 213-680-6499
26	

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Melodi Downs, declares as follows:

I am over 18 years of age and a citizen of the United States. I am employed as an executive assistant by the law firm of Riddell Williams P.S.

On the date noted below, I electronically filed the foregoing Defendants' Joint Motion for Revision to Briefing Schedule for Motion to Dismiss using the CM/ECF system which will notify the following:

- Floyd Abrams fabrams@cahill.com
- David M Balabanian david.balabanian@bingham.com
- Michael H. Barr mbarr@sonnenschein.com
- Walter Eugene Barton gbarton@karrtuttle.com,nrandall@karrtuttle.com,danderson@karrtuttle.com
- Steve W. Berman steve@hbsslaw.com,robert@hbsslaw.com,heatherw@hbsslaw.com
- Andrew B Brettler abrettler@stblaw.com
 - Frank Busch frank.busch@bingham.com,theo.robins@bingham.com,frank.downing@bingham.com
- Steven P Caplow stevencaplow@dwt.com,patrickwatts@dwt.com,robinklein@dwt.com,suzettebarbe r@dwt.com
- Kevin P Chavous kchavous@sonnenschein.com
- James J. Coster jcoster@ssbb.com,managingclerk@ssbb.com,jregan@ssbb.com

1	B .	Bruce Earl Larson
2	b	plarson@karrtuttle.com,psteinfeld@karrtuttle.com
3	41	Mike Liles , Jr nliles@karrtuttle.com
4	. (Christopher E Lometti
5	c	elometti@cohenmilstein.com
6	II	John D Lowery
7		lowery@riddellwilliams.com,dhammonds@riddellwilliams.com
8	FI .	Douglas C McDermott loug@mcdermottnewman.com
9		•
	11	Bradley T. Meissner oradley.meissner@dlapiper.com
10	. т	Γimothy Michael Moran
11	II	noran@kiplinglawgroup.com,cannon@kiplinglawgroup.com
12	• E	Brian O. O'Mara
13	b	oomara@csgrr.com
14	11	Barry Robert Ostrager
15	b	oostrager@stblaw.com,managingclerk@stblaw.com
	1.1	Nancy A Pacharzina
16	n	pacharzina@tousley.com,mhottman@tousley.com
17	ii	ohn D Pernick
18	_	ohn.pernick@bingham.com
19	Į.	Louis David Peterson dp@hcmp.com,smp@hcmp.com
20	,	Kenneth J Pfaehler
21		pfaehler@sonnenschein.com,nreeber@sonnenschein.com
22	• R	Robert J Pfister
		pfister@stblaw.com
23	• D	Daniel B Rehns
24	d	rehns@cohenmilstein.com
25		Kenneth M Rehns
26	k	rehns@cohenmilstein.com

	II		
1	•	Serena Richardson	
2		srichardson@labaton.com,ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com	
3	•	Rogelio Omar Riojas omar.riojas@dlapiper.com,nina.marie@dlapiper.com,karen.hansen@dlapiper.com	
4	. •	Darren J Robbins e file sd@csgrr.com	
5			
6	•	Tammy Roy troy@cahill.com	
7 8	•	Joshua M. Rubins jrubins@ssbb.com,managingclerk@ssbb.com,jregan@ssbb.com	
9	•	Stephen M. Rummage steverummage@dwt.com,jeannecadley@dwt.com	
11	•	Hollis Lee Salzman hsalzman@labaton.com,ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com	
12 13	•	Paul Scarlato pscarlato@labaton.com,ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com	
14	•	Arthur L Shingler ashingler@scott-scott.com,efile@scott-scott.com	
15 16	•	Gavin Williams Skok gskok@riddellwilliams.com,dhammonds@riddellwilliams.com	
17	•	W. D.C.	
18		kstephens@tousley.com,kzajac@tousley.com,cbonifaci@tousley.com	
19	•	Robert D Stewart stewart@kiplinglawgroup.com,cannon@kiplinglawgroup.com	
20	•	Steven J Toll	
21		stoll@cohenmilstein.com,efilings@cohenmilstein.com	
22	•	Mary Kay Vyskocil mvyskocil@stblaw.com	
23		Dennis H Walters	
24	•	dwalters@karrtuttle.com,wbarker@karrtuttle.com	
25	•	Adam Zurofsky	
26		azurofsky@cahill.com	

040210/1554/45991.00015

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 2nd day of April, 2010.

Melodi Downs